

LOC Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Solicited Vendors for Letter of Configuration (LOC) Number 43431, dated November 14, 2017 for the Mississippi Department of Corrections (MDOC)

From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

Date: December 6, 2017

Subject: LOC Cancelled - Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Jordan Barber

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8005

Contact E-mail Address: jordan.barber@its.ms.gov

Due to the possible release of project-specific information now contained in this Memorandum, LOC Number 43431 is being cancelled. A new LOC will be released at a later date. We are publishing the LOC Questions and Clarifications Memorandum details for review. These details are the subject of the possible release, and are now available to all solicited Vendors for this LOC.

LOC Number 43431 is hereby amended as follows:

1. Item 5.1 is being modified to read: "Vendor must provide pricing for the equipment listed in ~~Attachment A~~ Attachment A-1. Vendor must detail (by part number and/or description) any items that are functionally equivalent and substituted for the item listed in the table.
2. Item 5.7 is being modified to read: "Central Management (VM Based) - Vendor must provide a VM based Central Management Server. The Vendor must state for Items 5.7.1 through 5.7.5, how the proposed firewalls meet or exceed the requirement."
3. Item 8.1 is being modified to read: "Vendor must propose whatever training is recommended in order for local administrators to utilize the proposed system. A detailed description of the training including course/class content, duration, number of staff/size of class, and location of the training must be included with Vendor's response. Costs associated with training must be included in ~~Attachment A~~ Attachment A-1, Cost Information Form, as a separate line item."
4. Item 13.1 is being modified to read: "Please use the attached revised Cost Information Form (~~Attachment A~~ Attachment A-1) to provide cost information. Follow the instructions on the form. Incomplete forms will not be processed."
5. ATTACHMENT A - COST INFORMATION FORM is being replaced with ATTACHMENT A-1 – COST INFORMATION FORM.

6. ATTACHMENT E – NETWORK DIAGRAM is being added to the LOC.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Question 1: How many users are across the network

Response: **1,946 at this time representing multiple shifts that are 24x7.**

Question 2: How many users are traversing through this pair of firewalls?

Response: **All users.**

Question 3: Do you require a 2nd pair of firewalls for your 2nd Data Center noted in Section 2?

Response: **No, both Data Centers are behind the same existing pair of High Availability Firewalls.**

Question 4: Can you provide a network diagram?

Response: **Yes. Refer to Clarification Number 6 in this Memorandum.**

Question 5: Is it acceptable to note vendor responses on the RFP Word Document?

Response: **Yes.**

Question 6: We would like to submit a proposal for an equivalent product to Palo Alto with Forcepoint Next Gen Firewalls. There is one Technical Requirement listed that the Forcepoint product does not cover. "Are all Technical Requirements considered mandatory with bids not addressing each point automatically disqualified or can we add an explanation as to why one of the requirements is not necessary?"

Response: **No the requirements are not mandatory. Please refer to item 5.2 in the LOC. If Vendor believes the requirement is not necessary, the Vendor should take exception to the requirement following the instructions in Section 11.**

Question 7: Why did you guys send two word docs? Both look like they are the same doc.

Response: **The attachment was duplicated due to a technical error. Both attachments are the same.**

Question 8: In the LOC you describe quoting the PA-3060, URL filtering and threat prevention, but on Attachment A you just have a box to put cost for the PA-3060. The threat prevention and URL filtering is a subscription. Should that cost be combined with the PA-3060 or put under the software box?

Response: **Refer to Clarification Number 5. All software pricing should be included in the software section of Attachment A Cost Information Form.**

Question 9: Is it ok to email my submission?

Response: **Yes, refer to Item 14.1 in the LOC.**

Question 10: Do I need to add details in areas of the LOC where I agree or just put agreed?
Example 5.5.1

Response: **Yes, refer to Items 1.4 and 1.5 in the LOC.**

Question 11: Section 5.4.2 – Request 500 thousand concurrent sessions and at least 50 thousand new sessions per second. With a Max is 500K new connections with 50K new sessions/ps, you could possibly over run the firewall with 50K sessions ps. As an alternative, would it be acceptable to MDOC to have a firewall with 2 million concurrent connections and accept 24K new connections per second? Does MDOC need 50K new sessions per second?

Response:

- a. **Vendors can quote a firewall pair that exceeds and/ or meets both parameters, but not less on either parameter.**
- b. **MDOC would not initially be using 50k ps, this is for future proofing. MDOC does not want an inferior 24k per second session count. MDOC outgrew their current Firewall's ability to handle their session load, causing current major issues over the last 3 years, because MDOC compromised for reduced specs.**

Question 12: Section 5.4.4 – Does MDOC plan to have (40) Zones on an firewall that only has 18 network ports?

Response: **MDOC plans to have as many zones as needed. If 40 is needed, then MDOC will need 40 zones configured.**

Question13: Section 5.4.8 and Section 5.7 – in section 5.4.8 it request local management from the Firewall/appliance. In section 5.7-5.7.5 it discusses central management. Since two appliances are being deployed, is it to be understood that MDOC will manage the solution via a Central Management solution?

Response: **Refer to Clarification Numbers 2 and 5 in this Memorandum. MDOC needs centralized management.**

Question 14: Section 5.4.10 – Requirement here is for the firewall to support up to 10 virtual firewalls (Virtual systems or context). Would it be acceptable to use Zones, Network Objects, or interface groups instead of Contexts?

Response: **Virtual systems and zones are two different things and MDOC needs both.**

Question 15: Section 5.6.2 – requests that the solution support active/active and active passive HA configuration. Would it be acceptable to replace Active/Active with Clustering of the appliance? This provide a single configuration supported on 2-6 appliances all running at the same time.

Response: **MDOC needs the ability to configure active/Active and Active/passive.**

Question 16: Section 6.3.1.1 references that the solution should be aligned with the prevailing Singapore IPV6 profile found in www.ida.gov.sg. What requirements does MDOC have that points them to leverage standards from the prevailing Singapore IPV6 profile?

Response: At this time none. However, looking forward as technology evolves when countries and other entities come up with new standards and protocols, MDOC does not want to be constricted by having a firewall that cannot grow and conform to these new specifications. MDOC may be a State Agency, however the Internet is worldwide.

This LOC is being cancelled, and a new LOC will be released. If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Jordan Barber at 601-432-8005 or via email at jordan.barber@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 43431

Attachments: Attachment A-1 Cost Information Form
Attachment E Network Diagram